



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 150
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,515	12/05/2003	Anoop Anantha	MS306116.1/MSFTP502US	2367
27195 7590 07/16/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER TRAORE, FATOUMATA	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,515	ANANTHA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fatoumata Traore	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on May 08, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1-16, 18-32 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 18, 30-32 are amended by the applicant and claim 17 is also cancelled by the applicant.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claims 31 and 32 are drawn to a computer program product, which applicant has defined in the specification (page 6, lines 10-25) to encompass an electronic transmission signal. The Office considers an electronic signal to be a form of energy. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, an electronic transmission signal does not fall within any of the four categories of invention. Appropriated correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has cancelled claim 17, thus the objection has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2136

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the examiner notes the use of acronyms (API) throughout the claim 1 without first including a description in plaintext, as required. Applicant to address this objection has amended claim 1. Therefore the objection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 5 recites the limitation "an entity" in 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner is not Clair if the entity is the same as the one from claim 1 or if it is a new entity. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendment

7. Regarding Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-12:

Applicant has amended the claims to recite the limitation "***wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity***" It is noted, however, such this limitation was not previously recited in the claims. As such, this limitation is being treated as a newly added limitation and will so examined and argued accordingly (the same).

On page 9 of the reply, Applicant argued that the applied prior art fails to disclose the newly added limitation, "wherein the entity requests access..." As noted above, this limitation was not previously recited in the claim. However, upon

closer review of the references, it is submitted that the prior art of record discloses such feature.

First, Applicant is respectfully reminded that during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." (Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005)). See MPEP 2111.

Applicant stated that "the cited reference discloses a system for managing ...However, the access rights... themselves." The claims are not so limited. In that regard, the court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." See MPEP 2111, In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969), and also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Independent claim... was rejected as being unpatenble over **Garg et al** (6,289,458). Figure 1 of **Garg et al** shows a [first] entity (e.g., item 20) making a request access to an object (e.g., item 47) on behalf of another [second] entity (e.g., 40), the system user. See **Garg et al** at column 5, lines 37-60; column 7, lines 58-64. As further explained in detail in column 10, lines 36-47; an application 220 (first entity) issues a request to a service provider module 210 to access control module 240. Emphasis added.

Therefore, the examiner submits that Garg et al discloses each and every feature of the above claims and respectfully maintains the rejection.

8. Regarding Claims 18-32:

On page 10 of the response, Applicant argued that the applied references fail to disclose, "***wherein the security options include at least one of a restricted audience offer or conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type***". This feature is taught by Corrigan et al. See column 4, lines 22-25. Also, as described in column 5, lines 11-40, Corrigan et al discloses the security options.

Applicant also argued, on page 10, that Corrigan et al fails to disclose, "***wherein the entity is attempting access on behalf of another entity***." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 3, in particular figure 5, of Corrigan et al clearly shows a [first] entity making a request access on behalf of another [second] entity. See also column 10, line 66 to column 11, line 9.

With regard to the limitation of masking the object from the entity if permission does not exist as recited in claim 3, Garg et al discloses such feature. See figure 3(b) and column 8, lines 64-67; and column 11, lines 55-62.

There is no new ground of rejection when the basic thrust of the rejection remains the same. See *In re Kronig*, 539 F.2d 1300, 1302-03, 190 USPQ 425, 426-27 (CCPA 1976).

To the extent that the response to the applicant's arguments may have mentioned new portions of the prior art references, which were not used in the prior office action, this does not constitute new a new ground of rejection. It is clear that the prior art reference is of record and has been considered entirely by applicant. See In re Boyer, 363 F.2d 455, 458 n.2, 150 USPQ 441, 444, n.2 (CCPA 1966) and In re Bush, 296 F.2d 491, 496, 131 USPQ 263, 267 (CCPA 1961).

The mere fact that additional portions of the same reference may have been mentioned or relied upon does not constitute new ground of rejection. In re Meinhardt, 392, F.2d 273, 280, 157 USPQ 270, 275 (CCPA 1968).

Accordingly, this office action is being made final.

Therefore, the examiner submits that the combined teaching of Garg et al and Corrigan et al discloses each and every feature of the above claims and respectfully maintains the rejection.

9. Regarding claims 4, 7, 8, 13-17;

The examiner still maintains the rejection using the same rational as applied to claims 18-32 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2136

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-3, 5, 6,9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garg et al (US 6289458).

Claim 1: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

- i. A platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity; (Figure 1 and column 5, lines 37-60 column 7 lines 58-64 and column 10 lines 36-47);
- ii. A data store that stores security information on class of the objects (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40); and
- iii. A verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call API for the object and/or operate on the object (the access control module provide a centralize standard mechanism to evaluate whether or not various request for operations affecting objects should be granted or denied (column 7, lines 30-35).

Claim 2: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component exposes the object is permission exists (the data

structures includes fields defining whether access is granted) (column 3, lines30-35).

Claim 3: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component masks the object is permission does not exist (the data structures includes fields defining whether access is deny) (column 3, lines30-35).

Claim 5: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component facilitates that partners receive full access to API's and /or object s for which there is a business need and partial or limited access to other API's or business objects (a system user is granted and denied access to individual properties or sets of properties) (column 3, lines45-50).

Claim 6: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the data store provides a default or determined security information related to a class (the access control list contains zero or more access control entries, which define the access control applied to the object) (column 8, lines34-38).

Claim 9: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a management portal to facilitate authorization (file system manger maintains and coordinates access to file system) (column 7, lines 25-29).

Claim 10: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a component to provide an explicit security mapping for an object the access control list contains zero or more access control entries, which define the access control applied to the object. Each entry in the list defines a set of permission to be applied to a particular UUSERID or GROUPID with respect to either the object as a whole or individual properties of object. Desirably the order of entries in the access control list is significant) (column 8, lines 35-55).

Claim 11: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a component to enable an implicit security mapping from an explicit mapped object or to derive an implicit security permission by utilizing related objects (security descriptor provides details on the security and access control applicable to object (column 8, lines 25-30).

Claim 12: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the authorization employs operating system identities to facilitates security authorization procedure (security descriptor contains various properties including the owner security identifier and access control list) (column 8, lines 27-30).

12. Claims 18-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Corrigan et al.** (US 6640097).

Claim 18: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

- a. Storing one or more security options in a database, the security options related to automate billing and provisioning system wherein the security options include at least one of a restricted audience offer or conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type (column 4, lines 22-25, column 5 lines 11-40, column 10 line 66 to column 11 line 9) (column 2 lines 65-69, column 3 lines 1-3);
- b. Assigning security options to a class (the platform comprises means for controlling mobile subscriber access according to the security criteria) (column 2, lines 9-15); and
- c. Inheriting the security options by object members of the class (verification of subscriber access rights is an intrinsic part of the session management functions provided by the portal (column 9, lines 17-20).

Claim 19: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises at least one of explicit and implicit assigning the security options to object members of a class (security future such as white list or blacklist are used to authenticates access to particular services (column 5, lines 27-30).

Claim 20: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises accessing database via an application programming interface (in one

embodiment, the portal comprises a secure web-bases self provisioning interface comprising means for setting mobile network subscriber s to select a portfolio of personalized services (column 2, lines53-57).

Claim 21: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 20 above, and further authorizes the API (the node controls all subscriber accesses to the network operator managed service portfolio and authenticates the ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized (column 5, lines 33-38).

Claim 22: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprise returning an error code if an authorization procedure fails(the push server also support the push access protocol result notification. It will acknowledge successful or report unsuccessful transmission and delivery of the information pushed and return a status) (column 11, lines 10-15).

Claim 23: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprises analyzing a simple object request (a mobile user service request reaches the node as URL request in http format, and the node presents a login screen. The user inputs access security codes and the node interfaces on the internet side to have the required content delivered) (column 4 lines 1-10).

Claim 24: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprises

analyzing one or more security credentials (verification of subscriber access rights is an intrinsic part of the session management functions provided by the portal (column 9, lines 15-20).

Claim 25: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 24 above, and comprises employing a cache to process the credentials (portal comprises a customer care provisioning interface and a provisioning database) (column 2, lines 65-68, fig 2)

Claim 26: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises a subscription platform service (the platform comprises means for controlling subscriber access according to security criteria (column 2, lines 5-10).

Claim 27: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further discloses that the security options are associated with default security parameters (a generic subscriber class which is defined within the portal and represents common characteristics of all subscribers) (column 8, lines 44-48).

Claim 28: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises overriding default security parameters with other options (from the generic subscriber class are derived many subscriber sub-class that allow the portal to manage subscriber profiles across a wide range of different technologies) (column 8, lines 47-50).

Claim 29: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises employing an intermediate proxy that places call in a subscription on behalf of another tenant (the wireless application protocol (WAP) is a complete WAP capable mobile stations to access applications and services which may be hosted either within the network operator's own domain or in another location (column 10, lines 50-55).

Claim 30: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

- i. Means for authenticating at least one entity attempting access to an online billing and service (subscriber authentication) (column 4, line 33);
- ii. Means for authorizing the at least one entity (authorities subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines 50-55)); and
- iii. Means for associating a security parameter with at least one business object from a globalize region of database (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim 31: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

Art Unit: 2136

- i. An application programming interface packet to identify a partner (authenticates the subscriber ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized (column 5, lines 35-40);
- ii. A security credential packet to facilitate authorization of the partner (Authorized subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines 50-55); and
- iii. A security parameter packet inherited by a business object to facilitate access to a subscription platform database (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim 32: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

- i. At least one security field indicating global security parameters in a subscription platform database (Authorized subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines 50-55);
- II. At least one object field associated with an account in the database (the portal comprises means for instantiating a payment management class) (column 3, lines 25-30); and
- III. At least one class field to associate the security field object(the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object

property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 4, 7, 8, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan et al (US6640097).

Claim 4: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not disclose that the system further comprise a subscription platform to facilitate automated billing and provisioning accounts. Corrigan et al discloses a similar system, which provides billing and tariff generation with configurable billing provisioning functions (column 4, lines 45-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include subscription platform to facilitating automated billing and provisioning accounts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate accounts management.

Claim 7: Garg et al and Corrigan et al disclose a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 6 above, and Corrigan et al further comprises a component to override the default security information with higher or different security options (from the generic subscriber class are derived many subscriber sub-class that allow the portal to manage subscriber profiles across a wide range of different technologies) (column 8, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Garg et al to override default security with higher or different security options. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system efficient.

Claim 8: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose a component that supports proxies tenant callers. Corrigan et al discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a the wireless application protocol (WAP) is a complete WAP capable mobile stations to access applications and services which may be hosted either within the network operator's own domain or in another location (column 10, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Garg et al to support proxies tenant callers. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system flexible.

Claim 13: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises at least one of a sign-up API caller, an account management API caller, and a customer care API caller. Corrigan et al discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a customer care provisioning interface including a device provisioning function which enables the operator to ensure that content is matched to the device type (column 5, lines 10-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Garg et al to include a customer care API caller. One would have been motivated to do in order to simplify service management.

Claim 14: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 13 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises at least one API related to at least of a sign-up API group, an account management API group, a customer care API group, and object designer API group. Corrigan et al discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further a customer care provisioning interface including a device provisioning function which enables the operator to ensure that content is matched to the device type (column 5, lines 10-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was for Garg et al made to include a customer care API

group. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system efficient.

Claim 15: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises an authorization logic that determines whether an API can access an object via an access rights set. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a node acting as a service manager for mobile subscriber. It controls all subscriber accesses to the network operators managed service portfolio and authenticates the subscriber ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized to access a particular service before opening a secure connection (column 5, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include an authorization component in **Garg et al**. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Claim 16: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises at least one of a restricted audience offer, a conversion component, and a payment instrument component. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a payment management class from which are derived two sub-classes post-paid and pre-paid (column 10, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Garg et al to include a payment component. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Claim 17: Garg et al discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises a computer excusable instructions stored thereon to perform at least one of the platform component and the verification component. Corrigan et al discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a verification component (column 9, line15-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a verification component. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2136

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatoumata Traore whose telephone number is (571) 270-1685. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and every other Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nassar G. Moazzami, can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2685.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

FT
Monday July 9, 2007

Nassar G. Moazzami
Supervisory Patent Examiner



7, 7, 07